

THIS PAPER is published weekly, by CYRIL C. CADY, at \$1 in advance, or \$4 at the end of the year. No paper will be discontinued but at the option of the Editor until all arrears are paid—and a failure to give notice of a wish to discontinue will be considered a new engagement.

#### Rates of Advertising.

One dollar per square, of twelve lines, or less, for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square for each subsequent insertion.

For one square 12 months twenty dollars.

Merchants or others advertising by the year, to the amount of fifty dollars and upwards, will be entitled to a deduction of one third, where a regular agreement is entered into.

Where the insertion of an advertisement is ordered, without the number of insertions being specified, it will be inserted, (in the discretion of the proprietor) until forbad, and charged for accordingly.

All advertisements from strangers, as well as all orders for job-work, must be accompanied with the cash, or a reference to some responsible and convenient acquaintance.

#### An Extinguisher.—From Kentucky.

There being, within the bounds of our own knowledge, several candid men who have no other prominent objection to General Harrison than what has grown out of the abandoned falsehoods respecting Abolition, we this day publish, to the exclusion of almost every thing else, the powerful and annihilating address of the Kentucky Committee, through whom (it will be seen) on the 24th ultimo, General Harrison again endorsed his speeches, letters and votes, on that agitating topic. The tone is now changed! The Globe, and its echo, which have heretofore raised a false clamor against him for concealing his opinions, now denounce him for the indecency of reiterating them, when called upon in a proper and respectful manner. Will not every candid man be now satisfied—not only of the purity, integrity and fairness of this illustrious soldier and statesman, but of the abandoned character of the leading men by whom he is opposed. And, being convinced of this, how many will continue to oppose him from the mere slavish fear that they, too, if they follow the honorable promptings of their judgment and their conscience, may incur the denunciations of such men as the Editor of the Globe, and those who are led or driven by him. The eyes of the country are upon such, and their conduct now will be remembered by their neighbors heretofore. That none may plead ignorance of the unanswerable truths of this address, we have thrown off a sufficient number of extra copies to place one in the hands of every family in the county.

#### AN ADDRESS

Of the Central Whig Committee, for the Second District, to the people of Kentucky.

A few days since, an extra Advertiser, printed at Louisville, by Shadrack Penn, Jr. & Co., was given to the public, containing a long article signed by Levi Tyler, S. Penn, Jr., D. Meriwether, T. J. Read, and F. Geiger; styled, by them, "An address of the Democratic Central Committee, to the People of Kentucky."

The object of this Address is, obviously, to withdraw the attention of the People from a most corrupt and profligate Administration, by holding up Mr. Clay as the great adversary of the Abolitionists, and the unrivaled advocate of the Southern interests, (as if he needed the praise of that committee,) and by the most unscrupulous concealment of facts, and a perversion of argument—hoping to prove, what all candid men, who have given any attention to the subject, know not to be true, "that Gen. Harrison is an Abolitionist."

They do not even attempt to defeat the vile system of proscription for opinion's sake; they leave unanswered the charges of extravagance and defalcation with the countenance of the government, so frequently made and so fully proved upon the administration of Mr. Van Buren; they say nothing of the abominable attempt to unite the purse and the sword in the hands of the President, through the agency of the sub-treasury; not one word in extenuation is off by this Democratic Central Committee of the dangerous project of Mr. Van Buren's Secretary of War, proposed at the commencement of the present session of Congress, and which he in his message said he "could not too strongly recommend to their attention"—to raise, arm and equip, to be paid and officered by the General Government, an army of 100,000 men, in a time of peace; they forget to tell you that this scheme was considered so anti-democratic, and so fraught with danger to the liberties of the People, that even Thomas Ritchie, the leading political editor of their party in Virginia, refused to publish it, although proposed by the Whigs to be paid for as an advertisement; they especially forget to tell you that the Democrats of 1798, put down the elder Adams because (among other things) he had recommended a standing army of 10,000 men.

They forget to remind you of these matters, but they hesitate not to publish garbled extracts from a portion of Gen. Harrison's public letters and speeches, and to suppress others altogether, for the purpose of proving what they desire, but what they know is incapable of proof, to wit: that Gen. Harrison has always been and now is an Abolitionist, and that Martin Van Buren is not.

We say that Gen. Harrison is not and never was an Abolitionist; that on this question he is sound to the core. If we did not think so, we would pity or despise him. We propose to establish both these propositions:

In the first place, Gen. Harrison is the son of a slave-holder, was born and reared in a slave State, and there educated until he was 19 years old, when he joined Gen. Wayne's army, and came to the West. To suppose him to entertain opinions and feelings, which, if carried out, would lead to the deluging of his native State with blood, the desecrating of the tombs of his ancestors, and the destruction of this fair fabric of human liberty, in part the work of his illustrious sire, is to suppose him devoid of those attributes which honor human nature, and to possess others which belong only to moral monsters in human shape. The idea is preposterous; and those gentlemen of the Democratic Central Committee can scarcely believe it themselves. Bad men, can, without just cause, believe bad things of their fellows; but as we are not ready to say they are bad men, charity would induce us to trust, that they are persuaded by the hopelessness of their cause; and that in a moment of utter despair, they have consented to place their names to a publication, from which, under other circumstances, they would have recoiled.

But we proceed to the proof—to the evidence presented by the record—to the whole testimony, and not to a part.

In 1819, Gen. Harrison was a Representative in Congress from a district in Ohio, in which the village of Cheviot is situated. He had been elected by an overwhelming majority. During that session, Missouri presented herself for ad-

mission into the Union: her admission was opposed by the non-slaveholding States, unless she would present herself to Congress as a non-slaveholding State. Gen. Harrison voted for her admission as a slave State, with five other members from free States, not one of whom was from Ohio—thus preferring the discharge of his duty to his country and his conscience, to the enjoyment of unmerited popular applause—for that applause is always unmerited which is bestowed for a violation of the injunction of the solemn obligation to support the constitution of our country—and, entertaining those views, he could not, and did not, hesitate for a moment, between a sense of duty and selfish devotion to undesired popularity. The consequence to him was, that the popular current at the next election in his district overwhelmed him for a time, and he was defeated. But it was a defeat full of honor and glory; a defeat the result of his noble self-sacrifice to the rights of Missouri, and the perpetuity of our Union under the Federal Constitution; a defeat which he knew awaited him when he took his stand for her admission on the ramparts of the Constitution, but one which duty and patriotism called upon him to sustain.

Again, in 1822, he was a candidate for Congress in Ohio, and he was assailed with his votes in favor of Missouri, and in reference to the Territory of Arkansas. In vindication of his views and opinions on that subject, and the question of slavery generally, he published the following Address to his former constituents.

"Being called suddenly home to attend my sick family, I have but a moment to answer a few of the clamorous which are in circulation concerning me."

"I am accused of being friendly to slavery. From my earliest youth to the present moment, I have been the ardent friend of human liberty. At the age of eighteen, I became a member of an Abolition Society established at Richmond, Virginia; the object of which was to ameliorate the condition of slaves and procure their freedom by every legal means. My venerable friend, Judge Gatch of Clermont county, was also a member of this society, and has lately given me a certificate that I was one. The obligations which I then came under I have faithfully performed. I have been the means of liberating many slaves, but never placed one in bondage. I deny that my voice in Congress in relation to Missouri and Arkansas, are in the least incompatible with these principles. Congress had no more legal or constitutional right to emancipate the negroes in those sections of Louisiana without the consent of their owners, than they have to free those of Kentucky by a solemn covenant with France when the country was purchased from that power. To prohibit the emigration of citizens of the Southern States to the part of the country, the situation and climate of which was peculiarly suited to them, would have been highly unjust, as it had been purchased out of the common fund. Particularly, too, when it is recollected that all the immense territory to the north-west of the Ohio, had been ceded by Virginia, and with an unexampled liberality, she had herself proposed, by excluding slavery from it, to secure it for the emigration of those States which had no slaves. Was it proper, then, when reserved territory was in a great measure filled up, to exclude her citizens from every part of the territory purchased out of the common fund? I was the first person to introduce into Congress the proposition that all the country above the Missouri (which having no inhabitants was free from the objection made to Missouri and Arkansas) should never have slavery admitted into it. I repeat what I have before said, that as our Union was only effected by mutual concession, so only can it be preserved."

"My vote against the restriction of Missouri in forming her constitution was not a conclusive one; there would have been time enough, had I continued to be a member, before the question was decided, for my constituents to have instructed me, and I should have rejoiced in an opportunity of sacrificing my seat to my principles, if they had instructed me to oppose to my construction of the constitution. Like my other constituents from the non-slaveholding States, of whom I mention Shaw, Holmes, Mayson of Massachusetts, Lannan of Connecticut, and Baldwin of Pennsylvania, I could see nothing in the constitution which I had sworn to support, to warrant such an interference with the rights of the States, and which had never before been attempted. And where is the crime in one set of men not being able to interpret the constitution as other men interpret it? As we had all sworn to support it, the crime would have been in giving it a construction which our consciences would not sanction. And let me ask, for what good is this question again brought up? It has been settled, as all our family differences have been settled, on the firm basis of mutual compromise. And patriotism, as well as prudence, devoted the effects of that awful discussion to eternal oblivion. Is it not known, that from that cause the great fabric of our Union was shaken to its foundation? Is it not known that Missouri would not have submitted to the restriction, and that the other slaveholding States had determined to support her? But for this compromise, the probability is, that at this moment we might look upon the opposite shore of Ohio, not for an affectionate sister State, but for an armed and implacable rival. What patriotic man would not join the gallant Eaton in exhorting the head and hand that could divide and execute a scheme productive of a calamity so awful?"

"Upon the whole, fellow-citizens, our path is a plain one; it is that marked out as well by humanity as duty. We cannot emancipate the slaves of the other States with out their consent, but by producing a convulsion which would undo us all. For this much to be desired event, we must wait the slow but certain progress of those good principles which are every where gaining ground, and which assuredly will ultimately prevail."

With a lack of candor and fairness characteristic of the address of the Democratic Central Committee, they attempt to prove Gen. Harrison an Abolitionist by extracting the fit few lines of this Address, and affixing his name to it thus:

"Fellow Citizens: Being called suddenly home to attend my sick family, I have but a moment to answer a few clamorous which are in circulation concerning me."

I am accused of being friendly to slavery. From my earliest youth to the present moment, I have been the ardent friend of Human Liberty. At the age of eighteen, I became a member of an Abolition Society established at Richmond; the object of which was to ameliorate the condition of slaves, and procure their freedom by every legal means. My venerable friend Judge Gatch of Clermont county, was also a member of this Abolition Society, and has lately given me a certificate that I was one. The obligations which I then came under, I have faithfully performed."

\* \* \* WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON \*

"Who does not feel indignation swell in his heart at this attempt at the suppression of truth? In that extract, (being only a small portion of the Address of Gen. Harrison,) he says, he became a member of an Abolition society established in Richmond, Virginia, the object of which was, to ameliorate the condition of the slaves, and procure their freedom by every legal means. The purpose of that society, it is plain, was not to

abolish legal slavery, by illegal means, as the fanatics and incendiaries, such as Marcus Morton (the Van Buren Governor of Massachusetts,) Author Tappan, Garrison and others are ready to attempt. It was not established for the purpose of circulating inflammatory Abolition papers to excite the slaves to rapine, violence and rebellion: it was not for the purpose of getting up petitions to Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, (to do which M. Van Buren, says Congress is competent.) It was not for the purpose of getting up instructions to members of Congress to admit no State into the Federal Union, unless she would give up her right to have slaves, as did Martin Van Buren, a State Senator in New York, get up instructions to Rufus King, a Senator in Congress, at a time, when that terrible question was shaking the Union to its very centre. No—such was not the purpose of that Society in Richmond, formed in the very heart of the "Old Dominion." It was a "Humanity Society," that was its true style and name. And we would ask, was this wrong? Because we tolerate slavery, must we be in humane, refuse to vindicate the rights of those entitled to freedom by every legal means, and dishonor the name of Christian? In those days, it was no reproach to utter the sentiment, that slavery, was a great political evil, and that its existence was calculated to impair our national character. Then, and for many years after, the wisest heads and purest hearts were anxiously contemplating on that great evil, and meditating whether it were possible to get clear of it. Among these were Washington, the father of his country, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, Gov. Paine, Mason, Tucker, and many others. But these patriots never dreamed of any means but legal means—modern Abolitionists then unknown.

We invoke our Fellow-citizens not to be deceived by the garbled extract to which the Democratic Central Committee have dared to affix Gen. Harrison's name, as though it were the whole of the address—but in justice to a soldier and a patriot, to one whose whole life has been that of self-sacrifice, to read the whole address as given by us in this publication, and we hesitate not to say that you will pronounce it to be the effort not only of a clear mind, but of a pure heart—of one who loves his country above all other things. This society was formed in the very heart of the "Old Dominion," the mother of slave States, and some of Virginia's best blood as before stated, were its members. Harrison was a member of it at 18 years of age, had attended one of its meetings, when at 19 years old he was appointed an Ensign in the regular army, and joined Gen. Wayne's expedition and came to the West. So much for this foul and groundless charge.

But again—being on business at Vincennes in May, 1835, a public dinner was given him by his good old friends of Indiana, and being toasted, as is usual on such occasions, he delivered a speech to the people, an extract of so much of which as relates to this question, is in the following words:

"I have now, fellow-citizens, a few more words to say, on another subject, and which is, in my opinion, of more importance than any other that is now in the course of discussion in any part of the Union. I allude to the societies which have been formed, and the movements of certain individuals in some of the States in relation to a portion of the population in others. The conduct of these persons is the most dangerous, because their object is to excite the passions of all the States, which are produced by a community of interests and dangers in the war of the revolution, which was the foundation of our happy union, and by a continuance of which, it can alone be preserved. I entreat you, then, to frown upon the measures which are to produce results so much to be deprecated. The opinions which I have now given, I have omitted no opportunity for the last two years to lay before the people of my own State. I have taken the liberty to express them, knowing that even if they should unfortunately not accord with yours, they would be kindly received."

Remember, fellow-citizens, that this was in a free State, at Vincennes, in Indiana—that he might have omitted to notice the subject of abolition, but he felt and knew that he had, or deserved to have, some influence with the people of Indiana; he knew he had been faithful to them in peace and in war, and that, if there were any such deluded men as he had spoken of, (Abolitionists) in Indiana, he felt it his duty to his country to put them right in his power to do so. For chasteness and vigor of style, power of argument, felicity of illustration, and high souled patriotism, we pronounce this speech to be unsurpassed and but seldom equalled in the eloquence of this country. Having read the whole of this speech (which the Democratic Central Committee (save the mark) did not deem to give to the People) we will ask where is the man who can pronounce Gen. Harrison an Abolitionist? None such can be found, unless it be one who prefers the triumph of a reckless party, to truth, honor and justice!

Is further proof wanting? We refer you to Gen. Harrison's letter to Mr. Slog, of New Orleans, which is as follows:

CINCINNATI, 25th November, 1836.

My Dear Sir—I answer the question you proposed to me this morning, with great pleasure.

First: I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the States, or in any manner interfere with the property of the citizens in their slaves, but upon the application of the States; in which case, and in no other, they might appropriate money to aid the States so applying to get rid of their slaves. These opinions I have always held, and this was the ground upon which I voted against the Missouri restriction in the fifteenth Congress. The opinions given above are precisely those which were entertained by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison.

Second: I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Virginia and Maryland, and the people of the District.

I received a letter some time since, from John M. Berrien, Esq. of Ga., proposing questions, similar to those made by you, and I answered them more at length than I have now done, but to the same import.

In haste, yours truly,

WM. H. HARRISON.

To Thomas Slog, Jr. of New Orleans, now in Cincinnati.

And if further proof be required, we refer you to the letter of Hon. J. McP. Berrien, addressed to the Editor of the Charleston (S. C.) Courier.

From the Charleston (S. C.) Courier.

General Harrison and Abolition.—We give place with pleasure to the following letter, from a distinguished Georgian, in our recent call on him, adding another to the already multiplied proofs of General Harrison's soundness on the slave question.

SAVANNAH, April 11th, 1840.

Gentlemen: You call upon me, in your paper of

to effect their object (although their acts contradict their assertion) by no other means than by convincing the slave-holders that the emancipation of the slaves is called for, both by moral obligation and sound policy. An undisciplined youth, at the moment of his leaving (indeed, in many instances, before he has left it) his theological seminary, undertakes to give lectures upon morals to the countrymen of Wythe, Tucker, Pendleton and Lowndes, and lessons of political wisdom to states, whose affairs have so recently been directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford. Is it possible, that instances of greater vanity and presumption could be exhibited? But the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional. I do not say so, because there are any words in the constitution which forbid the discussions they were engaged in; I know that there are not. And citizens have the right to express and publish their opinions without restriction. But in the construction of the constitution, it is always necessary to refer to the circumstances under which it was framed, and to ascertain its meaning by a comparison of its provisions with each other, and with the previous situation of the several States who were parties to it. In a portion of these, slavery was recognized, and they took care to have the right secured to them, to follow and reclaim such of them as were fugitives to other States. The laws of Congress, passed under this power, have provided punishment for any one who shall oppose or interrupt the exercise of this right. Now can any one believe, that the instrument which contains a provision of this kind, which authorizes a master to pursue his slave into another State, take him back, and provide a punishment for any citizen or citizens of that State who should oppose him, should, at the same time, authorize the latter to assemble together, to pass resolutions, and adopt addresses, not only to encourage the slaves to leave their masters, but to cut their throats before they do so?

I insist, that if the citizens of the non-slaveholding States can avail themselves of the articles of the constitution, which prohibits the restriction of speech or the press to publish any thing injurious to the rights of the slaveholding States, they can go to the extreme that I have mentioned, and effect any thing further which writing or speaking could effect. But, fellow-citizens, these are not the principles of the constitution. Such a construction would defeat one of the great objects of its formation, which was that of securing the peace and harmony of the States which were parties to it. The liberty of speech, and of the press was given as the most effectual means to preserve to each and every citizen his own rights, and to the States the rights which appertained to them, at the time of their adoption. It could never have been expected that it would be used by the citizens of one portion of the States for the purpose of depriving those of another portion, of the rights which they had received at the adoption of the constitution, and in the exercise of which, they had themselves become so concerned or interested. If slavery is an evil, the evil is with them. If there is guilt in it, the guilt is theirs, not ours, since neither the States where it does not exist, nor the government of the United States, can, without usurpation of power, and the violation of a solemn compact, do any thing to remove it without the consent of those who are immediately interested. But they will neither ask for aid nor consent to be aided, whilst the illegal, persecuting and dangerous movements are in progress, of which I complain: the interest of all concerned requires that these should be stopped immediately. This can only be done by the force of public opinion, and that cannot too soon be brought into operation. Every movement which is made by the Abolitionists in the non-slaveholding States is viewed by our Southern brethren as an attack upon their rights, and which, if persisted in, must in the end eradicate those feelings of confidence and affection which bind the citizens of all the States, which are produced by a community of interests and dangers in the war of the revolution, which was the foundation of our happy union, and by a continuance of which, it can alone be preserved. I entreat you, then, to frown upon the measures which are to produce results so much to be deprecated. The opinions which I have now given, I have omitted no opportunity for the last two years to lay before the people of my own State. I have taken the liberty to express them, knowing that even if they should unfortunately not accord with yours, they would be kindly received."

Remember, fellow-citizens, that this was in a free State, at Vincennes, in Indiana—that he might have omitted to notice the subject of abolition, but he felt and knew that he had, or deserved to have, some influence with the people of Indiana; he knew he had been faithful to them in peace and in war, and that, if there were any such deluded men as he had spoken of, (Abolitionists) in Indiana, he felt it his duty to his country to put them right in his power to do so. For chasteness and vigor of style, power of argument, felicity of illustration, and high souled patriotism, we pronounce this speech to be unsurpassed and but seldom equalled in the eloquence of this country. Having read the whole of this speech (which the Democratic Central Committee (save the mark) did not deem to give to the People) we will ask where is the man who can pronounce Gen. Harrison an Abolitionist? None such can be found, unless it be one who prefers the triumph of a reckless party, to truth, honor and justice!

Is further proof wanting? We refer you to Gen. Harrison's letter to Mr. Slog, of New Orleans, which is as follows:

CINCINNATI, 25th November, 1836.

My Dear Sir—I answer the question you proposed to me this morning, with great pleasure.

First: I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the States, or in any manner interfere with the property of the citizens in their slaves, but upon the application of the States; in which case, and in no other, they might appropriate money to aid the States so applying to get rid of their slaves. These opinions I have always held, and this was the ground upon which I voted against the Missouri restriction in the fifteenth Congress. The opinions given above are precisely those which were entertained by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison.

Second: I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Virginia and Maryland, and the people of the District.

I received a letter some time since, from John M. Berrien, Esq. of Ga., proposing questions, similar to those made by you, and I answered them more at length than I have now done, but to the same import.

In haste, yours truly,

WM. H. HARRISON.

To Thomas Slog, Jr. of New Orleans, now in Cincinnati.

And if further proof be required, we refer you to the letter of Hon. J. McP. Berrien, addressed to the Editor of the Charleston (S. C.) Courier.

From the Charleston (S. C.) Courier.

General Harrison and Abolition.—We give place with pleasure to the following letter, from a distinguished Georgian, in our recent call on him, adding another to the already multiplied proofs of General Harrison's soundness on the slave question.

SAVANNAH, April 11th, 1840.

Gentlemen: You call upon me, in your paper of

to effect their object (although their acts contradict their assertion) by no other means than by convincing the slave-holders that the emancipation of the slaves is called for, both by moral obligation and sound policy. An undisciplined youth, at the moment of his leaving (indeed, in many instances, before he has left it) his theological seminary, undertakes to give lectures upon morals to the countrymen of Wythe, Tucker, Pendleton and Lowndes, and lessons of political wisdom to states, whose affairs have so recently been directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford. Is it possible, that instances of greater vanity and presumption could be exhibited? But the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional. I do not say so, because there are any words in the constitution which forbid the discussions they were engaged in; I know that there are not. And citizens have the right to express and publish their opinions without restriction. But in the construction of the constitution, it is always necessary to refer to the circumstances under which it was framed, and to ascertain its meaning by a comparison of its provisions with each other, and with the previous situation of the several States who were parties to it. In a portion of these, slavery was recognized, and they took care to have the right secured to them, to follow and reclaim such of them as were fugitives to other States. The laws of Congress, passed under this power, have provided punishment for any one who shall oppose or interrupt the exercise of this right. Now can any one believe, that the instrument which contains a provision of this kind, which authorizes a master to pursue his slave into another State, take him back, and provide a punishment for any citizen or citizens of that State who should oppose him, should, at the same time, authorize the latter to assemble together, to pass resolutions, and adopt addresses, not only to encourage the slaves to leave their masters, but to cut their throats before they do so?

the 5th inst., to make public a letter addressed to me by General Harrison, on the subject of abolition. I have already replied to a similar request, made by the editor of the Daily Telegraph, a paper published in this city: but as I know not if that paper (which has been recently established) is on your list of exchanges, and feel that the liberality of your conduct towards a political opponent, gives you an undoubted claim to the respect and courtesy of his friends, I repeat the substance of that answer.

The letter in question was written in 1836, in anticipation of a state of things which did not occur. It was, therefore, not made public, and I fear has not been preserved. At least, after a diligent search, among my papers, I have been unable to find it. Its contents, however, are perfectly within my recollection, and I do all that is in my power to comply with your request, by stating them, as I have done to the editor of the Telegraph. The letter embraced three points.

First: General Harrison denied the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the States, or in the District of Columbia.

Second: He expressed the opinion that the tariff compromise ought to remain undisturbed.

Third: He repudiated the practice of making appointments to office, the reward of partisan service.

This was the purport of the letter. I did not ask General Harrison's opinion because I doubted it. Having been in intimate intercourse with him for several years, I knew that his views on this subject were in accordance with my own.

I am, very respectfully, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

J. McPHERSON BERRIEN.

This letter from General Harrison to Mr. Berrien says he has mislaid, but he gives its substance. He says the letter was written in 1836, in anticipation of a state of things which did not occur, and was, therefore, not made public, and he fears has been lost. This Democratic Committee, however, says, when referring to this very letter, that "in a previous and longer letter to Mr. Berrien," [longer than Mr. Slog's] "the power to appropriate the National funds to the abolition of slavery, with the consent of the slave holding States, was also asserted; and for that reason it is supposed that the letter to Mr. Berrien was not published." Strange conjecture!

This conjecture, or half way assertion of this Committee is not true. Mr. Berrien gives the substance of the letter of Gen. Harrison to him, which he had mislaid, and no such sentiment is contained in it. But suppose such a sentiment had been contained in it, it was but the opinion of Jefferson, and Madison, the fathers of the constitution.

Can further proof be required that Gen. Harrison is not an Abolitionist, but that he is sound to the heart—aye, as sound as Mr. Clay himself, (whom this Democratic Committee seems to admire not less than Gen. Harrison's friends.) If so, it will be found in an extract from a speech delivered by him at Cheviot, Ohio, on the 14th July, 1833.

This, most men would have thought, an unfit occasion, [4th July celebration] again to revive a question with a people who had so signally rebuked him for his defence of Missouri and the rights of the South, and his friends urged him to say nothing at all about abolition; he thought otherwise. He saw his duty, and he followed it like a man.

A notice of the delivery of this speech will be found in Todd & Drake's Sketches of Harrison, p. 132. The speech is not there given, but it is therein stated to have been published by the Committee of Arrangements. A part of it presented a summary of the cause which led to the Revolutionary War, and a lucid exposition of the Constitution of the United States. The Democratic Committee publish the following extract from that speech, as though it were all that it contained upon the subject of Abolition and Colonization, and even split the paragraph, a part of which they published, because a sentiment followed which they were bound to approve. The garbled extract reads thus:

"Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation, I answer, that it has long been a subject near my heart to see the whole of its surplus revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding slaves, there appears to me to be no constitutional objection to its being thus applied, embracing not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed, but the purchase of the freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis, we might look forward to a day not very far distant, when a North American slave would not look down upon a slave."

We now present the whole of the Cheviot speech which relates to the subject of Abolition and Colonization—including the garbled extract published by the Democratic Central Committee, which is as follows:

"There is, however, a subject now beginning to agitate them, (the Southern States,) in relation to which, if their alarm has foundation, the relative situation in which they may stand to some of the States, will be the very reverse of what it now is. I allude to a supposed disposition in some individuals in the non-slaveholding States to interfere with the slave population of the other States, for the purpose of abolishing their constitution. I do not call your attention to this subject, fellow-citizens, from the apprehension that there is a man among you who will lend his aid to a project so pregnant with mischief, and still less that there is a State in the Union which could be brought to give it countenance. But such are the feelings of our Southern brethren upon this subject—such their views, and their just views, of the evils which an interference of this kind would bring upon them, that, long before we would reach the point of receiving the sanction of a State, the evil of the attempt, would be consummated, as far as we are concerned, by a dissolution of the Union. If there is any principle of the Constitution of the United States less disputable than any other, it is that the slave population is under the exclusive control of the States which possess them. If there is any measure likely to rivet the chains, and blast the prospects of the colored people, it is the interference of unauthorized persons. Can any one who is acquainted with the operations of the human mind doubt this. We have seen how revive our Southern brethren have been from a supposed violation of their political rights. What must be the consequence of an acknowledged violation of these rights (for every man of sense must admit it to be so,) combined with an insulting interference with their domestic concerns?"

"I will not stop to inquire into the motives of those who are engaged in this fatal and unconstitutional project. There may be some who have embarked in it without properly considering its consequences, and who are actuated by benevolent and virtuous principles. But, if such there are, I am very certain that they should continue their present course, their fellow-citizens would, even, 'curse the virtues which have undone their country!'"

"Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation, I answer, that it has long been an subject

near my heart to see the whole of its surplus revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding slaves, there appears to me to be no constitutional objection to its being thus applied, embracing not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed, but the purchase of the freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis, we might look forward to a day not very far distant, when a North American slave would not look down upon a slave. To those who have rejected the plan of colonization, I ask if they have well weighed the consequences of emancipation without it. How long would the emancipated negroes remain satisfied with that? Would any of the Southern States then (the negroes armed and organized) be able to resist their claims to a participation in all their political rights? Would it even stop there. Would they not claim admittance to all the social rights and privileges of a community in which, in some instances, they would compose the majority? Let those who take pleasure in the contemplation of such scenes as must inevitably follow, finish out the picture.

"If I am correct in the principles here advanced, I repeat my assertion that the discussion of the subject of emancipation in the non-slaveholding States is equally injurious to the slaves and their masters, and that it has no sanction in the principles of the Constitution. I must not be understood to say that there is any thing in that instrument which prohibits this discussion. I know there is not. But the man who believes that the claims which his fellow citizens have upon him are satisfied by adhering to the letter of the political compact that connects them, must have a very imperfect knowledge of the principles upon which our glorious Union was formed, and by which alone it can be maintained."

What southern or western man, Mr. Clay, Mr. Preston, Waddy Thompson, or even Mr. Calhoun himself, is sadder than Gen. Harrison, on this subject? Which of all or any of them, has delivered more powerful or eloquent arguments against Abolition, and in defence of the rights of the South in property of this kind, than has this most abused and calumniated statesman?

But again—there are ten Abolition papers in the United States—to wit: "The Ohio Philanthropist," "The Pittsburgh Witness," "The Pennsylvania Freeman," "The Connecticut Charter Oak," "The Utica Friend of Man," "The Michigan Freeman," "The New Hampshire Advocate of Freedom," "The Vermont Voice of Freedom," "The Massachusetts Abolitionist," and "The Boston Liberator," all of which earnestly and some of them bitterly, oppose the election of Gen. Harrison. Still, we perceive that men are to be found—yes, and Democratic Central Committee men too, who pronounce him an Abolitionist, who solemnly publish that he is the candidate of the Abolitionists, notwithstanding that party are denouncing him in all their papers, and have nominated candidates of their own, on the avowed and only ground of Abolition, and those nominees have accepted that nomination. In confirmation of this, we refer you to the following extract from the National Intelligencer of the 26th May, 1840.

THE ABOLITIONISTS.

The number of the "Emancipator" of Friday last has reached our hands, in which we find the following political notice:

"Anti-Slavery Nomination.—Messrs. Hiney and 'Earle having consented to place their names at 'the disposal of the Friends of Human Rights and 'Equal Laws for the ensuing Presidential canvass, we hope all anti-slavery papers will place the 'liberty ticket in a conspicuous part of their columns.'"

From an account of the late proceedings of the "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society," in the same paper, we find that a resolution was adopted declaring that, as Abolitionists, the members of this society "cannot give any countenance to the election of Martin Van Buren or William Henry Harrison, contain the sentiments and opinions which 'Harrison to the Presidency of the United States.'"

Still these Democratic Central Committee men pronounce and promulgate this slander on the patriot whom the Whig party of the Union, have selected as their candidate.

Is more proof wanted? We have given you Gen. Harrison's votes, and his published and acknowledged speeches and letters. We now present the following letter:

"NORTH BEND, June 24, 1840.

"Gentlemen: In answer to your inquiry 'whether the letters and speeches which have been published in my name by my political friends, particularly those contained in a pamphlet lately published in Cincinnati, by Col. C. S. Todd and Benjamin Drake Esq., contain the sentiments and opinions which I at present entertain,' I repeat what I have lately written to a committee of my friends in New York, that I should not consider myself an honest man to suffer these letters and speeches to be thus used without contradiction, if any alteration had taken place in my opinions."

I am,

Very respectfully,

Your fellow citizen,

W. H. HARRISON.

"To CHARLES M. THURSTON, HENRY TUCKER, G. W. ANDERSON, Louisville, Ky."

We would ask, is there a man within the bounds of this Union, who having read these proofs, will pronounce this great and good man an Abolitionist? Such man must have taken leave of his senses.

What will the Democratic Central Committee say to this letter? They may say that it is too late. Suppose, then, that in November last, he had given this renewed avowal of his opinions as contained in the speeches, letters and votes to which we have referred you, and to which he refers Messrs. Thurston, Pirtle and Anderson; they would have then said "he was electioneering." Suppose he had not written at all, (surely with no intelligent man, was it necessary, after what he had so recently, and so frequently written, spoken, and published, on this very question,) why, then they would have said "he wished to conceal his opinions," as they have already said. So, fellow-citizens, you will perceive that there is no possible mode in which the tastes of his opponents can be suited. They are not for him under any circumstances. He is a patriot, and it galls him: he is honest, and it grieves them.

You all remember, when it was thought probable that Mr. Clay would be the Whig candidate, that the Van Buren papers at the North denounced him as a slave holder, and therefore they opposed him, whilst those at the South denounced him as an Abolitionist, and, therefore, they opposed him. But now he is out of the way, these same papers, as does this Democratic Central Committee, find him to the skies for his sound and Abolition opinions. What faith is to be put in publications from such sources, or in the man whose claims on our confidence are supported by such unworthy means.

It will be seen, also, by the above letter, that the political opinions of Gen. Harrison on other subjects, explicitly stated by his letters and speeches, quoted in the pamphlet of Messrs. Todd and Drake, and other publications in his name by his political friends, are stated to be his opinions now without alteration. Is this concealment? His opinions on every subject that has excited the attention of the American people, have been more clearly made known in a thousand publications, than those of any other candidate for the Presidency we have ever had.

But the Central Democratic Committee, for the purpose of overthrowing the effect of his vote in favor of Missouri, and of destroying the force of his speech at Vincennes, and his letters to Mr. Slog, and to Mr. Berrien, and the Cheviot speech, etc., vote given by Gen. Harrison as a member of the